R E P O R T  R E S U M E S

ED 018 496 UD 004 955

TITLE I, ESEA, EVALUATION REPORT, 1966-67.

BY- SHELDON, DOROTHY

IDAHO STATE DEPT. OF EDUCATION, BOISE

PUB DATE 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$2.12 51P.

DESCRIPTORS- *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, *COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, *ANNUAL REPORTS, *FEDERAL PROGRAMS, INNOVATION, TEACHER AIDES, KINDERGARTEN, LIBRARY PROGRAMS, PHYSICAL FITNESS, STATE AGENCIES, SCHOOL DISTRICTS, INTERAGENCY COORDINATION, TABLES (DATA), PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION, TEST RESULTS, STUDENT IMPROVEMENT, READING PROGRAMS, HANDICAPPED STUDENTS, ESEA TITLE 1, IDAHO

THIS ANNUAL EVALUATION OF IDAHO'S 1966-67 TITLE I PROJECTS ACKNOWLEDGES SOME INITIAL NEGATIVE ATTITUDES TOWARD TITLE I ON THE PART OF SCHOOL BOARDS, ADMINISTRATORS, TEACHERS, PARENTS, AND STUDENTS. PART I OF THE EVALUATION LISTS MAJOR ACHIEVEMENTS AS (1) A DOUBLING OF THE NUMBER OF KINDERGARTENS FROM NINE TO 18, (2) AN INCREASE FROM 10 TO 31 LIBRARY PROGRAMS, (3) AN INCREASE IN READING PROGRAMS FROM 68 TO 92, (4) THE HIRING OF 180 ADULT TEACHER AIDES, AND (5) THE INTRODUCTION OF PHYSICAL FITNESS CLASSES IN 12 DISTRICTS. THE REPORT DESCRIBES THE TYPES OF SERVICES TO LOCAL AGENCIES WHICH THE STATE PROVIDED AND LISTS THE MOST PRESSING EDUCATIONAL NEEDS AND MOST PREVALENT PROJECT OBJECTIVES. IT ALSO DISCUSSES THE COORDINATION OF TITLE I WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES. THERE ARE ADDITIONAL SECTIONS ON STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND UTILIZATION, INVOLVEMENT OF NONPUBLIC SCHOOL CHILDREN, AND PROGRAMS FOR HANDICAPPED STUDENTS. THE MAJOR PROBLEMS ON LOCAL LEVELS AND THE ATTEMPTS TO RESOLVE THEM ARE NOTED. PART II PRESENTS THE "PUPIL AND PROGRAM ANALYSIS," WHICH INCLUDES TABULAR DATA AND A DESCRIPTION OF SUCH INNOVATIVE AND EXEMPLARY PROJECTS AS MOBILE DIAGNOSTIC READING LABORATORIES, DEVELOPMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS, AND PHYSICAL FITNESS PROGRAMS. (NH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED018496

IDAHO STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Division of Instruction

# TITLE I, ESEA

# EVALUATION REPORT
# 1966-67

UD 004 955

Prepared by
Dorothy Sheldon, Consultant

D. F. Engelking
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

V. Reid Bishop
Deputy State Superintendent
Division of Instruction

I. I hate it.

II. But it did Me good.

by Hayla Apple

## FOREWORD

Gayla Apple, a student in Rupert District #331 may have expressed the feelings of many school people in Idaho when she replied, "I hate it, but it did me good", in answer to a student evaluation questionnaire at the end of the Title I summer school.

From the state level to the student level there has been some negative feeling toward Title I. Repeatedly, on the evaluation reports from the LEA's the evaluators mentioned a change of attitude (in a positive direction) among school board members, local administrators, teachers, parents, and students regarding Title I activities.

Some people objected to having federal funds in the schools because they feared eventual federal "control" or there was local apprehension about future Federal funding. Others were opposed to the categorical aid requirement of Title I. Some educators disliked having new programs added to an already full schedule. Still others felt threatened by outsiders, specialists or resource people, coming into the classrooms.

The need for a change of attitude indicated that there was some reservation, if not apprehension toward Title I. The teachers'attitude toward the slow learner changed, indicating some prior lack of concern or lack of knowledge concerning this type of child. The change of attitude was frequently caused by the undeniable fact that "it (the program) did me good". In many cases test scores indicated improvement in pupil achievement (see Part II) but more often a change was not easy to measure.

Human interest stories relating change in behavior and teacher observations relating noticeable improvement in class work are important evidence that the programs established to help educationally deprived children have done some good. Information gleaned from the narrative reports submitted by the LEA's, as well as tabular data, are included in this second Annual Evaluation of Title I, P.L. 89-10 in Idaho.

## PART I

Major Achievements . . . . . Page 1

Description of Activities. . . . . Page 4

Problems Resolved. . . . . Page 28

## PART II

Tabular Data . . . . . Page 32

Exemplary and Innovative Projects. . . Page 34

PART I

STATEWIDE SUMMARY

I. MAJOR ACHIEVEMENTS:

There were five major achievements under Title I of statewide significance in 1966-67 in educating disadvantaged children. They were:

A. Kindergarten - The number of kindergarten projects increased from nine in 1965-66 to eighteen in 1966-67. Approximately 500 children attended full year kindergartens and 600 children attended summer kindergarten programs. Kindergarten projects are encouraged because we believe this is a step on the educational ladder where reading problems and other educational problems can be prevented. Since Idaho does not have public school kindergarten most of Idaho's children enter first grade with no pre-school training. Approximately 900 children received pre-school experience in Head Start during the same fiscal year. The two programs provided pre-school experience for approximately 10% of the youngsters entering first grade in 1967.

The significant thing about these programs is that they have demonstrated the value of kindergarten experience for children. It is possible that there will be more support for state supported kindergartens in the next Legislature because of the experience the public schools have had with Title I kindergarten programs.

B. Library - In 1966-67 there were 31 library projects, an increase of ten over school year 1965-66. 42 librarians were hired under Title I as compared to 13 in 1965-66. Library projects involved establishing centralized elementary libraries, purchasing materials and equipment, and providing training for teachers to qualify them as librarians. In a state where elementary centralized libraries were almost non-existent when school started in 1965, this is considered a major educational achievement.

C. Reading Improvement - The number of reading programs increased from 68 in 1965-66 under Title I to 92 in fiscal year 1967. Since the greatest identified need of the children eligible for Title I participation is in the area of reading improvement, it is significant that so many districts attempted to meet this need. The reading programs considered most effective were those in which there was a strong emphasis on prevention of reading problems. Soda Springs District #150 is cited as an exemplary program in Part II.

D. Teacher Aides - 180 adults were hired as teacher aides using Title I funds in 1966-67. In addition to this, Hagerman School District #233 had 38 students working as teacher aide volunteers. The use of teacher aides is considered significant because it indicates the sincere attempt made by superintendents to provide individual help for educationally deprived children. Since few specially trained

reading teachers were available, the aides were used to perform non-instructional duties so classroom teachers could give individual help. Aides were also used to prepare special materials for the teacher to use with children with learning problems. The ten duties most frequently performed by teacher aides were:

1. Duplicate instructional materials.
2. Type instructional materials.
3. Assist in playground activities.
4. File instructional materials.
5. Search for a variety of books and materials from which pupils can learn.
6. Assist in supervision of lunchroom.
7. Patrol grounds when recreational skills are not being taught.
8. Grade objective type tests.
9. Collect money.
10. Assist in supervision of corridors and cafeterias.

E. Physical Fitness - Twelve districts had physical fitness classes in 1965-66 funded under Title I. This number increased to 18 the following year. There is a high correlation between muscle coordination and academic achievement. This is one reason the addition of physical fitness programs was significant.

## II. DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES AND METHODS

A. SEA services to LEA's - The SEA provided services to the LEA's in the following areas:

1. Project Development -

SEA Title I staff consulted with LEA administrators during on-site visits or during visits by the LEA representative to the state office. Programs were recommended that would adequately meet identified needs of children. In many cases, it was suggested that the ongoing program be discontinued and another program established. LEA's were urged to keep their programs within the guidelines established by the Office of Education. Size, scope, and quality were frequently mentioned.

Additional activities which make a project more effective were frequently recommended. For instance, if a district planned to have a summer school with emphasis on reading improvement the state agency suggested the addition of physical fitness as a means of motivating the students. Also, because of the high correlation between low achievement and lack of muscle coordination, the inclusion of physical fitness strengthened the summer program to meet more needs of these children.

State Title I personnel rely heavily on the local districts for information relative to the success or

failure of activities within a Title I project. Recommendations were frequently made on the basis of the experience of districts within the state. Generally, it was easier to implement a program that had been previously tried in Idaho than it was to implement a program from another state.

2. Project Implementation -

During school year 1966-67 SEA Title I personnel visited each of the 107 eligible districts at least two times to give assistance and/or to observe the Title I program. Occasionally, misunderstanding of the purpose of Title I was observed. This was frequently a misunderstanding of the scope of Title I. For example, too few activities had been included to make the program effective, or so many children were being included in the program that it appeared impossible that the special educational needs of these children would be significantly reduced. Further, SEA Title I staff encouraged districts to obligate all of the money to which they were entitled.

3. Project Evaluation -

During on-site visits. SEA Title I personnel interpreted the USOE requirements for an annual evaluation. Local Title I staff were encouraged to keep adequate records to complete their evaluation.

Local districts were asked to suggest ways the evaluation could be made less burdensome and more meaningful.

LEA's were encouraged to hire personnel specifically for evaluation or as project directors to oversee the entire Title I operation.

LEA's were asked to look critically at their projects and consider the possibility of establishing different programs rather than continuing the same program year after year without re-evaluating the needs of the children or without re-examining the guidelines.

The results of the evaluation report of the 1965-66 Title I program were used to recommend program improvement in many areas. In addition to the evaluation report the results of a survey of the Title I teacher aide program provided SEA staff with important information with which to help local districts evaluate the effectiveness of their teacher aide programs.

4. Information Dissemination -

The SEA conducted four regional workshops (Happenings) in April of 1967 to share promising Title I programs with districts in the various regions of the state. The programs selected for dissemination were those that had unique or exemplary features which make them effective in meeting needs of children.

Video tapes of three of the programs were shown. These included the Soda Springs Reading Improvement program, the summer Kindergarten program in Council, and the Kimberly summer school program. A 16 mm film of the Caldwell Title I Physical Fitness project was used, as well as, films of a teacher aide at work, the Special Education program in Twin Falls, and the Gooding School for Deaf and Blind. In addition, the film "Resources for Learning" prepared by Dr. Richard E. Lewis, San Jose State College, California and IDEA film "Make a Mighty Reach" were shown. The film strip "Title I Off and Running" was included in the program as was a slide show made by SEA Title I personnel entitled "Let's Plan a Title I Program".

Dr. Conrad Potter from the USOE Regional Office in San Francisco was a guest speaker at each of these meetings. Each participant in the meetings was given instruction in the production of transparencies in an effort to encourage the use of overhead projectors which were purchased using Title I funds.

Another means of disseminating information among the various districts is the use of a loose leaf binder, Your Title I Ideas Handbook SEA Title I personnel are preparing ideas for dissemination which can be stored in this notebook. The ideas pertain to money saving

and time saving suggestions, program suggestions, ideas for more effective use of instructional materials, equipment and personnel. LEA's have been requested to keep the SEA informed of ideas that they feel worth being shared with other districts.

During on-site visits Title I personnel frequently share promising practices which have been seen in operation or that have been described in correspondence related to Title I programs in other states.

A summary of Title I programs was compiled by State Title I Staff. This summary was distributed to all of the LEA's, as well as, to all the state agencies and to the USOE.

LEA's are disseminating data to other local agencies by sharing ideas at regional and state meetings and to the State agency by forwarding news clippings and other pertinent information

B. <u>Most Pressing Educational Needs</u>

In rank order the five most pressing student educational needs which the districts identified to meet during the regular school year were:

1. Improved skills in reading - Standardized tests, and teacher observation were used to determine this need.
2. Improved self image and improved attitude toward School - Teacher and administrator observation,

anecdotal records, and, in some cases, attitude scales identify this need.

3. Individual attention - Teacher observation and anecdotal records were used to determine this need.
4. Readiness for school - Standardized tests and first grade teachers' observations were used to identify children who indicate lack of readiness for school.
5. Improve social adjustment - Teacher and administrator observation and anecdotal records indicated a need for improved social adjustment.

Although Idaho educators are beginning to assess their school programs in terms of individual pupil needs rather than in school or district needs, identifying pupil needs is still the number one problem in most of our school districts. Title I programs have been developed without first establishing the most pressing needs. This is an area in which the State Title I staff plans to give more and better direction to the local districts for the coming school year.

C. Most Prevalent Project Objectives

In rank order the most prevalent project objectives indicated in Item 9 of the project applications for the school year 1966-67 were:

1. To improve classroom performance in reading.
2. To improve performance as measured by tests.
3. To improve classroom performance in other skill areas.

4. To improve children's verbal functioning.

5. To change their attitudes towards school and Education.

The lack of a clear understanding of identifying needs, and determining objectives before planning activities to meet the objectives is indicated in the types of activities that were most frequently included in the Title I projects for the school year 1966-67. In rank order the five activities appearing most frequently as a part of Title I programs were:

1. Reading - Remedial or Reading Improvement.
2. Sub-Professional Help, Reducing Class Size, Guidance.
3. In-Service Training.
4. Library and Instructional Media Centers.
5. Physical Fitness and Health and Summer School.

It is interesting to note that improved attitude was the second ranking identified need and yet it was the fifth ranking objective. Also, the need for individual attention was ranked as the third most pressing need, yet there was no objective listed that is specifically related to this need. However, the second most frequent activity(teacher aides, reducing class size, and increasing guidance services) would meet this need. The fourth need which is for readiness is fairly closely related to the objective to improve verbal

functioning. However, the activity most closely associated with readiness would be a pre-school or kindergarten program which ranked ninth among the activities.

D. Title I Activities and Those of Other Federal Programs

Judging from the LEA reports Idaho schools are effectively coordinating services of several federal programs. Specifically, the activities that were supplemented by those of other federal programs are listed below:

1. Title II ESEA - The most prevalent inter-relationship was between Title I and Title II. Several districts used Title I funds to construct or remodel a library facility that could house the new materials acquired through Title II. St.Maries District #41purchased a mobile unit to be used as a library. Blackfoot District spent $25,000.00 for construction of a new library and many districts did minor remodeling of $2,000.00 or less under Title I.

52 districts indicated their Title I programs were supplemented by Title II of ESEA which added to the overall program by supplying more library resource materials as well as special books for remedial reading. Further, resource materials purchased with Title II funds were available for use by teacher aides working with Title I teachers and students.

2. Title III ESEA - Many cases of interaction between Titles I and TII were reported. An audio visual production room was established in 1965-66 using Title I funds in Hagerman District #233. Student and adult aides use this room and equipment in conjunction with the district's Title III Exemplary Individualized Learning Center.

20 students from Rupert District #331 participated in the American Falls District #381 Outdoor Education Pilot Program.

18 districts who are participating in the Idaho Falls District #91 Title III Snake River Center for the Improvement of Instruction reported their teachers received in-service training and consultative services from the center.

Kendrick District #283 had a Title III Rural Fitness Program in the summer of 1967 with which they coordinated Title I activities.

Caldwell District #132 is part of an inter-district Title III program, "Exceptional Child Center". The teachers who are hired for the Title I physical fitness program in the elementary schools in Caldwell spend time each week working with emotionally disturbed children who have been identified and are receiving therapy in the above mentioned Title III project.

Melba District #136 used Title I funds in 1966-67 to complete remodeling for an individualized learning center patterned after the Exemplary Individualized Learning Center in Hagerman District #233

3. Title IV ESEA - Terry Armstrong, Title I Project Director for Caldwell District #139; Mrs. Ella Hilverda, Title I Project Director and Summer School Director for Kimberly District #411; and Mrs. Dorothy Sheldon, SEA Title I Consultant, served as members of various advisory committees appointed by Northwest Regional Educational Research Laboratory located in Portland, Oregon. This experience proved valuable in subsequent coordination of Title I and Title IV activities. Kimberly District now has a Pilot Program in Guidance with Mrs. Hilverda as Counselor Coordinator.

Several districts reported they had used information from research that was made available to them through Title IV projects.

4. Title V ESEA - Several districts reported they had received assistance with their Title I programs from additional specialists in the State Department who were hired under Title V of ESEA. One district

said that the availability of Title V funds has enabled the Idaho State Department of Education to expand to the point that it can render service to the local districts.

5. Community Action Agency - Several Title I summer programs were supplemented by CAA programs by coordinating transportation and a hot lunch program. One CAA had a remedial reading program for low achievers in the summer. Title I students were recommended for this program.

6. Neighborhood Youth Corps - Eleven districts reported that their Title I activities were supplemented by NYC students working as aides for teachers in the Title I programs. In one district the elementary school librarian was hired using Title I funds, books were added to the library using Title II funds, and the aide in the library received financial assistance under Neighborhood Youth Corps. The districts reported that the NYC program helped keep potential drop-outs in school.

7. Head Start - Buses that were used in Head Start programs joined with the Title I buses to provide transportation for more students. Kindergarten teaching materials which were used in Head Start

were shared with the Title I kindergarten teachers. In several districts the Head Start program operated in the same building as the Title I reading program providing coordination between the two programs. A public school teacher who taught in a summer Head Start program provided information to the primary teachers in the areas of health, nutrition, and readiness for first grade.

8. Title V NDEA - Seven districts reported that Title V personnel provided counseling and guidance services to Title I children.

9. Title III NDEA - Thirteen districts reported that they used equipment purchased under Title III in their Title I programs. They said that this equipment, which was checked out to Title I teachers, supplemented and enriched their Title I activities.

10. Upward Bound - Several disadvantaged youths from the Pocatello public schools participated in project Upward Bound.

11. Other - Hansen District #415 and Hagerman District #233 joined a four-state, eight school amplified Art-by-Telephone program from Mesquite, Nevada. This program was an experiment funded by the Ford Foundation. The Art-by-Telephone was funded in Hagerman and Hansen using Title I funds.

Aberdeen District #58 established an Auto Mechanics class under Title I. Course work in auto mechanics and secretarial training was available to the students through Idaho State University. This program was partially sponsored using federal money through the Office of Vocational Education.

One district reported that the elementary specialists in speech and vision coordinated their Title I program closely with the existing public health services in their city.

The Idaho State School for the Deaf and Blind in Gooding received captioned films for use in their in-service training programs for Title I teachers and teacher aides. These films are made available through Public Laws 89-715, 89-258, and 87-276.

The State School and Hospital at Nampa utilized the services of college students as aides in their various training programs in conjunction with S.W.E.A.T. (Summer Work Experience and Training) and the college work program. Job Corps volunteers contributed time at the Nampa school in cooperation with the Title I activities. H.I.P. (Hospital Improvement Program) provided speech equipment and funds for speech therapists who participated in

Title I activities at the Nampa State School. H.I.S.T. (Hospital In-Service Training) provided in-service training for Special Education teachers working in the Title I program in the Nampa State School.

E. Staff Development and Utilization

Obtaining qualified staff was reported on the LEA evaluation forms as the third ranking major problem in implementing Title I projects. Specifically, there was a shortage of specialized teachers for reading, special education, physical fitness, speech therapy, psychology, and guidance. The most effective activities undertaken to develop and to improve staff utilization for special programs included:

1. In-Service Training - 37% of the project applications contained some provision for in-service training. In Coeur d'Alene, St. Anthony, Kamiah, Meridian, and Boise, specialists were hired to assist the classroom teachers in instruction, as well as to give help to individual children in such areas as speech therapy, physical fitness, art, music, and guidance.

   Frequently the person conducting the in-service training was a local staff member who had received special training during a summer school or an institute. Other persons conducting in-

service training workshops were University and College personnel, commercial representatives, State Department of Education Consultants, specialists from nearby districts, and consultants from the Snake River Center for the Improvement of Instruction in Idaho Falls.

2. New Approaches to Teaching - Team or cooperative teaching programs were used in several districts in an effort to use the special talents of the classroom teachers. Title I funds were used to pay the travel expense of teachers who visited team teaching schools in neighboring states and/or neighboring districts.

   Notus District #135 provided tutoring for students after school and on Saturday. The tutors were members of the teaching staff and received additional salary to tutor children with special learning problems.

3. Closed-Circuit Television - Nine districts purchased video tape recorders and cameras for use in their local districts. This means of communication allowed teachers to be supported on video tape by experts in various fields. Also, teachers made video tapes of demonstrations that would need to be repeated several times during the school year. By taping the

presentation, the teachers saved hours of their teaching time.

4. Teacher Aides - 49 districts employed 185 aides during the school year 1966-67. In addition, one third of the student body in the Hagerman Junior-Senior High School worked as volunteer aides. The aides relieved the teachers of non-instructional duties so the teachers had more time for planning, giving individual help to children, and improving teaching methods.

5. Reduce Class Size - Twelve districts reduced class size through the employment of additional teachers during the regular school year. 106 elementary teachers and 79 secondary teachers were employed during the regular school year 1966-67 for this purpose.

6. Clerical Personnel - 67 secretaries were hired to relieve administrators and teachers of clerical duties.

7. Mobile Units - St. Maries District #41 and Boise Independent School District #1 purchased mobile units which made it possible for one teacher to visit many schools during the school week. In St. Maries the mobile unit is for transporting

audio-visual instructional materials and equipment to remote schools in the area. The person driving the unit is the elementary librarian. She also gives the teachers help during her visits to the school. In Boise the mobile unit is equipped for speech and hearing testing, as well as therapy. The therapist drives the unit to the various schools within the district. During the 1966-67 school year· 4,639 children received therapy and/or testing in this mobile unit.

The problem of recruiting teachers for Title I programs was not as crucial as it was the first year of Title I since the districts had time to employ teachers in the spring for the coming school year. In Idaho there is a perennial problem of a shortage of well qualified specialists, however, it was no more difficult to obtain such personnel for Title I than for similar programs in the regular school program. Any problems related to recruiting teachers are covered in the third section of this evaluation under "problems resolved".

F. Involvement of Non-Public School Children

The SEA reminded the LEA's during regional meetings that non-public school officials are to be involved in planning Title I programs and that non-public school children are to share equally with public school children in Title I activities.

LEA's reported various degrees of success in involving non-public school children in Title I activities. One or more of the following steps was taken by the 30 districts, in which non-public schools are located, to encourage non-public school participation.

1. Non-public school officials were visited personally to cooperate in a reading program in the public school

2. Meetings were held with parochial school personnel to explain the Title I program.

3. Public meetings were held to explain Title I to both public and non-public school patrons simultaneously.

4. An advisory committee was formed which included principals of public and non-public schools. This committee decided what projects should be implemented.

5. Non-public school officials were invited to visit a Title I project to see how non-public school pupils could benefit from the program.

6. Notices of Title I program were sent to homes of public and non-public school pupils. Newspaper and radio announcements specifically included an invitation to non-public school students.

7. Parents of non-public school students were invited to visit with the Title I teacher and hear an explanation of the program.

8. Non-public and public school mothers joined together to "get the word out" regarding a Title I summer program.

9. Non-public school officials were informed by letter of the Title I program and invited to participate.

Successes and failures encountered by public school officials in involving non-public school students in programs included the following:

1. Excellent cooperation between public and non-public officials resulted in many non-public students receiving help through several kindergarten programs.

2. Vision and hearing tests were given to all non-public students in one district.

3. The elementary libraries in another district remained open after school and on Saturday to provide utilization by non-public students.

4. One district reported a greater proportion of eligible non-public than eligible public school students participated in a music program.

5. Some non-public schools sent their teachers to observe a Title I reading class and to borrow materials and equipment for use in similar classes in the non-public schools.

6. An in-service training program for volunteer library aides was conducted by public school personnel for public and non-public school aides.

7. One district reported the cooperation between public and non-public school personnel caused a change in attitude (in a positive direction) among members of the community regarding non-public schools.

8. Several districts reported no success in involving non-public school students in their Title I programs. The reason was reported to be due to "a matter of basic principle, not due to hard feelings toward the public school".

The most frequent problems involved in developing and implementing programs in which non-public students might participate were reported to be:

1. Difficulty maintaining communication between public and non-public officials.

2. Non-public school teachers indicated willingness to cooperate and a desire to have their students

participate in Title I activities, but the church officials, who have the final authority, did not accept the programs on the grounds they were opposed to federal participation in education.

3. The distance between public and non-public schools made it difficult for students to participate in programs which were conducted during the school day in the public school.

Only two LEA's suggested changes in legislation concerning public and non-public school participation. These suggestions were as follows:

1. Allow non-public schools to apply independently for Title I programs.

2. One district said, "The public schools are open to all children. Parents who choose to send their children to non-public schools do so in anticipation of rewards not thought to be available in the public schools. Future legislation should consider this fact before including non-public schools".

The Title I activities in which non-public school children participated most frequently and reported to be most effective were:

1. Use of library after school and Saturday

2. Summer reading programs.

3. Summer recreation programs.

4. Teacher use of materials and equipment from a Title I resource center.

5. Subject specialists, especially music and physical education, who visited non-public schools on a regularly scheduled basis for in-service training of teachers as well as for instruction of students.

G. Programs Designed for Handicapped Students

Approximately $180,000.00 or about 6% of the total state allocation for 1966-67 was budgeted by 14 districts for special education activities.

1. The SEA encouraged and promoted LEA-operated activities for handicapped children in the following ways:

a. LEA's were encouraged during on-site visits to use Title I funds to expand or improve their present special education programs. Specific suggestions included remodeling of facilities, purchase of instructional materials and equipment, and hiring teachers and teacher aides.

b. A 30-minute color film of two Title I projects for handicapped children was made by Communicar, an activity of Project Public Information, at the request of SEA Title I personnel. The film included a physical education program for

handicapped children in Twin Falls District #411. The program was established in 1966-67 using Title I funds. Also, in the film was the Title I project at the Gooding State School for the Deaf and Blind. The film clearly showed what could and is being done with Title I funds for special education children. The film was shown to approximately 400 people at the Title I regional meetings (Happenings) in April, 1967. The film was narrated by Edward Reay, Superintendent of Gooding State School for Deaf and Blind and by Mrs. Eleanor Bodahl, Consultant, Special Education, Idaho State Department of Education.

2. The five most effective activities conducted by LEA's and designed for handicapped children were:

   a. Teacher Aides - Teacher aides were employed to relieve special education teachers of non-instructional duties so the teachers could give more individual attention to children.

   b. Mobile Unit - A mobile classroom was purchased by Orofino District #171 for their special education class. It is located on the school ground in the midst of several other such units which have been purchased to relieve an over-crowded condition in the district. This is the

first time the handicapped children have been in anything other than sub-standard facilities away from the school.

c. Teachers - Sixteen teachers were hired to either establish new classes or to relieve overcrowded conditions in present classrooms.

d. Specialists = Specialists were employed to give instruction to teachers and students in physical education, art, and music. Speech therapists were hired to test and give speech therapy to special education children.

e. Remodeling and Construction - Several districts, including Nampa State School and Hospital, remodeled classrooms to expand an existing program to include vocational courses or to establish a special program such as physical education.

Twin Falls District used $25,000 of their Title I grant to supplement district funds for construction of a small gymnasium needed to establish a physical education program for handicapped children.

## III. PROBLEMS RESOLVED

LEA's were asked to report any major problems they encountered in implementing Title I projects. In rank order the five most pressing problems taken from a list of thirty were:

Lack of school facilities

Inadequate Title I funds

Program evaluation

Obtaining qualified staff

Identifying pupil needs

Training of staff and designing projects to meet pupil needs were also mentioned frequently.

The above problems were not satisfactorily resolved. The LEA's simply operated programs in spite of them. The following observations by SEA Title I personnel may help to explain why the above problems existed and how they may be eventually resolved.

### A. General aid versus Categorical aid

There is a rather widespread belief among the LEA's that general aid is preferable to categorical aid. Some districts continue to purchase equipment and materials for use throughout the entire school district rather than for use in special programs for a few educationally disadvantaged children. Part of the reason for this is the failure to identify the educational needs of the individual children before establishing a program.

Further, there is a tendency for LEA's to establish

programs which will include every child and every teacher in a given school, but will have little or no effect on individuals. An example is employing one teacher aide for 80 high school teachers.

B. Funding Schedule

A major source of difficulty is the timing of the Congressional appropriation. It is not compatible with the traditional funding schedule of the public schools. LEA's were hesitant to give contracts to Title I teachers in March before they knew the amount of their grants for the next year. This coupled with the 6% to 10% cut in funds over the first year caused some disappointment and discouragement among school officials in obtaining staff.

Also, in January, 1966 and again in January, 1967 additional appropriations were made by Congress, thus making it possible for LEA's to submit additional projects or to amend their present proposal. This proved to be a burden to the SEA Title I office which was at best just keeping ahead of the work load.

C. Poorly qualified Staff

Several districts who attempted to establish programs after July 1, 1966 for the 1966-67 school year met with severe disappointment. Because these districts were forced to take "the left overs" their programs failed. Two teachers were forced to resign shortly after school began. They could not be replaced so there was a last

minute change to another program. In two other cases poorly qualified teachers were allowed to continue, but the school officials felt the programs were totally ineffective and a waste of everyone's time.

Several districts hired teacher aides to relieve teachers of non-teaching duties after they determined that special teachers were not available for new programs. In other districts equipment and materials were purchased and used by classroom teachers with educationally handicapped children in the regular classroom.

Resolution of Problems

The SEA has established several procedures which have relieved some of the burdens which Title I imposed on LEA's. The SEA now requires that a district submit no more than one project and that the project be written for the maximum basic grant for fiscal year 1966. The project is approved by the SEA for only the amount of the tentative grant. The approved amount can then be raised immediately upon notification of additional Congressional allocations. In the meantime, the LEA must file with the SEA a letter stating they will not obligate funds in excess of the approved amount, or if they choose to obligate excess funds, the difference will be paid from local district funds. This procedure has virtually eliminated the necessity of writing amendments.

Another problem that has been partially solved is the delay experienced in submitting project applications. Most districts did not submit their proposals in 1966 until fall after school personnel returned from summer vacation. Traditionally, the first weeks of school are extremely busy. The Idaho SEA is attempting to reduce some of the problems caused by hasty writing of proposals or by neglect to submit a project prior to beginning the program. It was possible after July 1, 1967 for a district to submit a letter stating its intent to participate in Title I for school year 1967-68. A brief description of the proposed activities was required at that time. The SEA used the date of receipt of the letter as the date of approval of the project, however, no funding was made to the district or no project number was assigned prior to receiving the project application. This procedure was well accepted and has made a smoother operation at the state level since we know early which districts intend to participate. It is helpful to the LEA's to know their allocations are being held for them and it gives them time to carefully prepare the project application themselves or to receive help from SEA Title I staff during on-site visits. By October 15, 1967, the SEA had received project applications from 90 of the 107 eligible districts.

## PART II

## PUPIL AND PROGRAM ANALYSIS

I. TABULAR DATA:

A. Table I - The Idaho SEA does not compile ADA and ADM information on individual units. The LEA's are required to submit district-wide enrollment by grade and ADA by elementary and secondary divisions. From this, the SEA compiles various statewide data.

The nine month ADA for all schools for grades 1 - 12 in 1966-67 was 91.33% of the enrollment for the same year. This is 40% greater than the ADA for the previous year and .13% greater than for school year 1964-65. There was a .5% increase in enrollment for 1966-67 over 1965-66. This would indicate that there was less absenteeism in the entire state in school year 1966-67 than in either of the preceding two years. This decrease cannot be attributed directly to Title I activities since only 63 of the 614 public schools in the state had 1/3 or more of their students participating in Title I activities.

There were frequent reports by teachers of improved attendance because of a Title I activity, usually a physical fitness program. There were also reports of less illness and consequently improved attendance among students who received health services. These are isolated cases and could not be included as evidence that the improved statewide ADA was even indirectly affected by Title I.

SEA Title I staff will receive more meaningful attendance figures for Title I schools for the present school year because of the proposed change by USOE in evaluation procedures.

B. Table II - Following the 1966-67 school term the Idaho SEA conducted a statewide drop-out study. Each of the 117 districts was asked to complete a questionnaire regarding drop-outs in grades 7 - 12. 43 districts did not return the questionnaire in time to be included in the Title I evaluation report. Within these districts there are two schools in which 1/3 or more of the students participated in a Title I program during school year 1966-67. Table II contains all of the information concerning school drop-outs available at this time.

C. Tables III-A through III-E - These tables represent a compilation of test scores from all districts in the state who administered pre and post tests to Title I participants. The districts were requested by the SEA to report test results only if they used one or more of the following tests:

Metropolitan Achievement Test
SRA Achievement Test
Iowa Test of Basic Skills
Stanford Achievement Test
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test
President's Test for Physical Fitness

In several instances the LEA data was incomplete. In such cases the reports were discarded. One exception is in reporting the number of students ranking in the various percentile groups. The number of students in the third

column of the tables refers to only the number for whom either raw scores or grade placement equivalents were reported. If the LEA reported only the percentile groupings without raw scores or grade placements for students, and if these students were pre and post tested on the same dates using the same form as those for whom scores and grade placement equivalent were reported, they were included on the tables in the various percentile categories. This explains why the total number of students in the last four columns is sometimes different from the number of students in the third column.

D. Table IV is self explanatory.

## II. INNOVATIVE AND EXEMPLARY PROJECTS:

Title I gave educators a unique opportunity to solve old problems using new methods. The requirement that a Title I program contain a new approach encouraged administrators to innovate and experiment. Specific examples of programs that contained exemplary or innovative features are:

A. Mobile Diagnostic Reading Labs. - Bonneville District #93 near Idaho Falls purchased and equipped three 10' x 60' trailers to house a special reading program. The units cost approximately $9,000.00 each and each one can accommodate about 20 students at one time. Each trailer is divided into three sections to provide remedial, diagnostic, and developmental reading. The units are under the supervision of three

reading specialists who described the reading program in the following way:

"A testing program for grades one through six is the main service offered. Children having reading problems or exhibiting a lack of expected achievement are referred to the Lab by the classroom teacher, working directly through the elementary principals.

When the testing is completed, conferences are held with the principal and the teacher. The results of the testing are interpreted to those called into the conference. Suggestions are offered and plans formulated with the principal and teacher whereby assistance and help may be given to the student. Occasionally, parents are called into the conference.

The Lab is divided into three sections. The testing section is devoted to individual testing. This area is utilized by the guidance director and the school nurse. The middle section provides a conference room and a study center for students. The remedial reading section provides six individual study carrels and an instruction center.

The Remedial reading program offers individual instruction after a thorough diagnostic program identifies a child's reading difficulties. Remediation will continue until deficiencies are eliminated and the child is performing up to grade level. Teaching tapes and a variety of remedial materials scaled to the childs independent reading level provide an opportunity for each child to experience the feeling of accomplishment. Stimulating materials provide motivation for the child that is working on grade level but who is working below his potential."

About 225 children were served by the Labs during the 1966-67 school year. The teachers reported that there were varying degrees of achievement in reading at the end of the first year. Those children whose problems were not severe showed strong, rapid growth attributed mainly to individual interest and attention. The children whose problems were compounded showed the least amount of achievement. However, in the areas of attitude and self-concept there was

a dramatic improvement. The children enjoyed working in the attractive, well-equipped Lab. There was no stigma attached to those students who were selected to attend reading improvement classes and the community enthusiastically supported the programs. (See attached brochure)

B. Development of Instructional Materials - The reluctant learners in grades 1 - 3 in Lewiston District #1 are the beneficiaries of supplemental instructional materials in mathematics and social studies prepared during two Summer Writing Workshops. In 1966 a team of Lewiston teachers, compiled the methods and materials of cuisenaire arithmetic into a Teacher's Guide and a Student Book. Those aspects of the cuisenaire program which were somewhat frustrating or difficult to handle were modified or eliminated. Scope and sequence were added to the program. The director of the writing workshop said, "We need to take the child where we find him and free him into a world of inquiry and acquisition that depends upon his knowledge, skills and general state of readiness rather than an arbitrary, lockstep system which generally confuses the slow learner and frustrates the fast learner".

The social studies text that was written in the writing workshop deals with local and somewhat familiar subject matter which will motivate the child and will help him establish points of identification. The project director said, "The child's local environment is more meaningful to him, at the

primary age, than is the larger more nebulous world environment." He further said that among the important skills to be developed at this age are the ability to reason and evaluate, and the skill of communication.

The primary student needs that the participants in the writing workshops identified to meet were:

1. An awareness and understanding of their own community.
2. An understanding of the basic operation of arithmetic

In the 1967 summer workshop the texts were revised from evaluations made by teachers who used the text during the 1966-67 school year.

Lewiston District #1 receives an annual Title I grant of about $67,000. Approximately 25% of their 1966 grant and 6% of the 1967 grant was spent for the writing workshops. This project is considered innovative because of the concept of local teacher-writing teams developing instructional materials. The Lewiston texts can be used to meet individual student needs through either classroom or individualized instruction. Similar books could be written by other districts to meet local student needs. The textbooks produced in Lewiston are not attached to this report because they are too bulky. The USOE may obtain a copy of both texts by writing to:

Andrew L. Smith, Superintendent
Independent School District #1
Lewiston, Idaho

C. Exemplary Physical Education Programs - Caldwell District #132 spent more than one-third of their $57,000 grant in 1966-67 on a concentrated physical fitness program to meet needs of over 1,000 educationally deprived children in the district. The program included diagnostic, remedial, and developmental activities.

For the educationally deprived children in grades 1-3 an elementary physical education specialist was employed to introduce a physical fitness program. Rhythm and coordination were emphasized as well as group participation and learning games. Gymnastics, floor exercises, rope skipping, and visual instructional aids were also a part of the program.

Caldwell has shown conclusively through this program that slow learners are also below average in physical ability and development. They hope to find out if improved physical ability will materially affect performance in the classroom. The program did help increase the attendance of pupils during school year 1966-67.

"The social and emotional aspect of the program has been of great value. Boys and girls participate together with no regard to economic, race, creed, or color barriers," said the physical education director.

Special attention was given to seeking out pupils in need of corrective exercises in grades 4-12 and to securing special equipment and supplies to help meet the needs

of these children. 1719 boys and girls in grades 4-12 were tested twice in 1966-67 using the Basic Fitness Tests by Edwin A. Fleishman. Any student who scored 70 points on the test was given a certificate of achievement and any student showing at least 10 points of improvement on the second test was given a certificate of improvement. (see attachment). The director said that the awarding of the certificates created a better attitude toward the program by both students and parents. 1000 certificates were awarded during 1966-67.

As part of the testing program the district sent a letter to the parents of all students who scored below the 45th percentile on the first test. The teacher indicated the student's areas of weakness and encouraged the parents to have the student do a few exercises at home each day. The teacher reported that the letters did do some good because some of these students improved as much as 30 points on the second test. The director added that the school program of physical fitness alone would not increase a student's performance that much without outside help. A sample copy of the letter to parents is attached to this report.

The district produced a 30 minute 16mm film which showed all aspects of the physical fitness program. It was shown to all of the Caldwell service clubs and was shown to about 400 educators throughout the state by the State Department of Education at the Title I regional meetings (Happenings) in April, 1967.

TABLE II

DROPOUT RATES FOR TITLE I PROJECT SCHOOLS

COMPARED WITH ALL OTHER PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THE STATE

| GRADE | | 1966 - 1967 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Title I Schools | | All Other Public Schools |
| | | ALL | 1/3 or More Participants[1]/ | |
| 12 | | 0 | 49 | 505 |
| 11 | | 0 | 63 | 612 |
| 10 | Information | 0 | 42 | 447 |
| 9 | Not Available | 0 | 30 | 207 |
| 8 | for 1963 | 0 | 10 | 96 |
| 7 | through 1965 | 0 | 30 | 67 |
| No. of Schools | | 0 | 16 | 112 |
| Total No. of Students | | 0 | 6,121 | 176,263 |
| No. of Dropouts | | 0 | 224 | 1,934 |

1/ Those Schools in which 1/3 or more of the student enrollment participated in Title I programs.

TABLE III-A
STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I ESEA 1966-67
Groups taking Pre and Post Tests

| Grade Level | # of Students | Date Administered Pre | Date Administered Post | Name of Test | Form Pre | Form Post | Raw Score Mean Pre | Raw Score Mean Post | Grade Equivalent Mean Pre | Grade Equivalent Mean Post | Raw Score Std. Div. Pre | Raw Score Std. Div. Post | # below 25th%tile Pre | # below 25th%tile Post | 26th to 50th%tile Pre | 26th to 50th%tile Post | 51st to 75th%tile Pre | 51st to 75th%tile Post | 76th%tile and above Pre | 76th%tile and above Post |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| K | 111 | 9-66 | 5-67 | Metropolitan Readiness | A | A | | | | | | | 84 | 2 | 22 | 8 | 14 | 46 | 1 | 55 |
| K | 70 | " | " | Peabody Picture Vocabulary | B | A | 58 | 62.3 | | | 6.49 | 5.53 | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 70 | 6-67 | 7-67 | California Reading | W | X | | | 1.46 | 1.61 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 28 | " | " | " | " | " | | | 2.2 | 2.4 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 54 | 9-66 | 5-67 | " | " | " | 59 | 65 | | | | | 24 | 22 | 26 | 23 | 4 | 9 | | |
| 3 | 29 | 6-67 | 7-67 | " | X | W | | | 2.7 | 3.0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | 14 | 9-66 | 5-67 | " | W | X | | | 2.9 | 3.9 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | 66 | " | " | " | " | " | 70 | 72 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | 45 | " | " | " | " | " | 63 | 69 | | | | | 16 | 6 | 24 | 31 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 2 |
| 4 | 13 | " | " | " | " | " | | | 3.6 | 5.1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 6 | 6-67 | 7-67 | " | X | W | | | 5.7 | 6.2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 8 | 9-66 | 5-67 | " | " | " | | | 4.45 | 5.7 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 37 | " | " | " | W | X | 63 | 65 | | | | | 18 | 12 | 14 | 16 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 2 |
| 6 | 7 | 6-67 | 7-67 | " | X | W | | | 6.1 | 8.7 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | 14 | 9-66 | 5-67 | " | " | " | | | 5.6 | 6.7 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | 46 | " | " | " | W | X | 64 | 68 | | | | | 11 | 10 | 21 | 20 | 12 | 11 | 2 | 5 |
| 1-6 | 844 | 5-66 | 5-67 | President's Test-Physical Fitness | | | Passed 49.2% | 50.8% | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 37 | 6-67 | 7-67 | SRA Reading | C | D | 43 | 42 | | | | | 7 | 7 | 8 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 34 | 9-66 | 5-67 | " | C | B | | | | | | | 8 | 5 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 9 |

TABLE III-B
STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I ESEA 1966-67
Groups taking Pre and Post Tests

| Grade Level | # of Students | Date Administered Pre | Post | Name of Test | Form Pre | Post | Raw Score Mean Pre | Post | Grade Equivalent Mean Pre | Post | Raw Score Std. Div. Pre | Post | # below 25th%tile Pre | Post | 26th to 50th%tile Pre | Post | 51st to 75th%tile Pre | Post | 76th%tile and above Pre | Post |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | 106 | 6-67 | 7-67 | SRA Reading | C | D | 35.4 | 43.9 | | | | | 23 | 17 | 19 | 20 | 14 | 18 | 18 | 19 |
| 4 | 32 | 5-66 | 5-67 | " | " | " | 39 | 53 | | | | | 0 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 18 | 15 |
| 4 | 30 | 6-67 | 7-67 | " | " | " | 36.8 | 36.7 | | | | | 21 | 20 | 7 | 10 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 48 | 5-66 | 5-67 | " | " | " | 55 | 61 | | | | | 2 | 7 | 10 | 13 | 21 | 17 | 15 | 11 |
| 6 | 16 | 6-67 | 7-67 | " | " | " | 36.2 | 36.8 | | | | | 9 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 51 | 5-66 | 5-67 | " | " | " | 63 | 71 | | | | | 4 | 4 | 11 | 15 | 19 | 19 | 17 | 13 |
| 7 | 7 | 6-67 | 7-67 | " | " | " | 46.1 | 41.1 | | | | | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 8 | 9-66 | 5-67 | " | A | B | | | | | | | 5 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 8 | 13 | " | " | " | " | " | | | | | | | 11 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 9 | " | " | " | " | " | | | | | | | 6 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | 9 | " | " | " | " | " | | | | | | | 6 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 11 | 8 | " | " | " | " | " | | | | | | | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 1 |
| 12 | 4 | " | " | " | " | " | | | | | | | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 16 | 6-67 | 7-67 | SRA Arithmetic | C | D | 55.8 | 67.1 | | | | | 7 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 3 |
| 3 | 41 | " | " | " | " | " | 56.3 | 70.4 | | | | | 12 | 11 | 21 | 10 | 7 | 10 | 1 | 10 |
| 4 | 30 | " | " | " | " | " | 55.6 | 60.1 | | | | | 12 | 13 | 16 | 9 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 2 |
| 6 | 16 | " | " | " | " | " | 62.7 | 64.8 | | | | | 8 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| 7 | 7 | " | " | " | " | " | 46.1 | 41.4 | | | | | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 16 | " | " | SRA English | " | " | 62.1 | 65.4 | | | | | 7 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |

TABLE III-C
STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I ESEA 1966-67
Groups taking Pre and Post Tests

| Grade Level | # of Students | Date Administered Pre | Date Administered Post | Name of Test | Form Pre | Form Post | Raw Score Mean Pre | Raw Score Mean Post | Grade Equivalent Mean Pre | Grade Equivalent Mean Post | Raw Score Std. Div. Pre | Raw Score Std. Div. Post | # below 25thZtile Pre | # below 25thZtile Post | 26th to 50thZtile Pre | 26th to 50thZtile Post | 51st to 75thZtile Pre | 51st to 75thZtile Post | 76thZtile and above Pre | 76thZtile and above Post |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | 17 | 6-67 | 7-67 | SRA English | C | D | 64.1 | 73.8 | | | | | 6 | 5 | 9 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| 4 | 8 | " | " | " | " | " | 68.5 | 74.6 | | | | | 7 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | Stanford Achievement | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 8 | 6-67 | 7-67 | " | W | W | | | 1.65 | 1.62 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 111 | 9-66 | 5-67 | " | " | " | | | 1.8 | 2.6 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | 129 | " | " | " | W | X | | | 2.5 | 3.3 | | | 65 | 43 | 23 | 36 | 21 | 31 | 20 | 19 |
| 4 | 179 | " | " | " | " | " | | | 2.7 | 3.5 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 199 | " | " | " | " | " | | | 4.1 | 4.85 | | | 29 | 21 | 26 | 33 | 26 | 26 | 18 | 14 |
| 6 | 222 | " | " | " | " | " | | | 5.0 | 6.1 | | | 49 | 54 | 59 | 48 | 50 | 54 | 34 | 52 |
| 7 | 80 | " | " | " | " | " | | | 5.4 | 7.0 | | | 20 | 18 | 23 | 19 | 16 | 18 | 15 | 17 |
| 8 | 237 | " | " | " | " | " | | | 7.7 | 9.1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Iowa Test of Basic Skills | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | 34 | 9-66 | 5-67 | " | 2 | 3 | | | 3.1 | 3.1 | 5.099 | 5.245 | 20 | 19 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 17 | " | " | " | 1 | 2 | | | 3.7 | 4.6 | | | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 34 | " | " | " | 3 | 3 | 30 | 33 | | | 4.918 | 9.336 | 32 | 24 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 21 | " | " | " | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | 1 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 5 |
| 4 | 29 | 6-67 | 7-67 | " | " | " | | | 3.2 | 3.9 | | | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 7 | 9-66 | 2-67 | " | 1 | 4 | | | 4.1 | 4.1 | | | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 2 | " | " | " | 1 | 4 | | | 5.1 | 5.4 | | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

TABLE III-D
STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I ESEA 1966-67
Groups taking Pre and Post Tests

| Grade Level | # of Students | Date Administered Pre | Date Administered Post | Name of Test | Form Pre | Form Post | Raw Score Mean Pre | Raw Score Mean Post | Grade Equivalent Mean Pre | Grade Equivalent Mean Post | Raw Score Std. Div. Pre | Raw Score Std. Div. Post | # below 25thZtile Pre | # below 25thZtile Post | 26th to 50thZtile Pre | 26th to 50thZtile Post | 51st to 75thZtile Pre | 51st to 75thZtile Post | 76thZtile and above Pre | 76thZtile and above Post |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | 13 | 9-66 | 5-67 | Iowa Test of Basic Skills | 1 | 2 | | | 3.9 | 4.8 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 33 | " | " | " | 3 | 3 | 33 | 37 | | | 4.504 | 5.349 | 30 | 26 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 25 | 6-67 | 7-67 | " | 1 | 2 | | | 4.5 | 4.9 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 27 | 9-66 | 5-67 | " | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | 2 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 9 |
| 6 | 10 | " | " | " | 1 | 2 | | | 4.82 | 4.5 | | | 0 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 58 | " | " | " | " | " | | | | | | | 55 | 47 | 3 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 25 | " | " | " | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | 2 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 4 |
| 6 | 153 | " | " | " | 1 | 2 | 31 | 33 | | | 7.811 | 5.686 | 51 | 42 | 76 | 75 | 26 | 31 | 0 | 5 |
| 6 | 19 | 6-67 | 7-67 | " | " | " | | | 4.7 | 5.6 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 7 | 9-66 | 2-67 | " | " | " | | | 5.3 | 5.7 | | | 6 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 10 | " | " | " | " | " | | | 6.2 | 6.6 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 5 | " | 5-67 | " | " | " | | | 5.5 | 5.9 | | | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 21 | " | " | " | 1 | 3 | | | | | | | 6 | 6 | 11 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 7 | 29 | " | " | " | 3 | 3 | 15 | 17 | | | 5.856 | 8.888 | 29 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 11 | " | " | " | 1 | 2 | | | 7.7 | 7.8 | | | 1 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 8 | 24 | " | " | " | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | 3 | 4 | 12 | 14 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| 8 | 29 | " | " | " | 3 | 3 | 18 | 20 | | | 9.644 | 11.705 | 29 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 7 | " | 2-67 | " | 1 | 4 | | | 5.3 | 5.7 | | | 6 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

## TABLE III-E
## STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I ESEA 1966-67
### Groups taking Pre and Post Tests

| Grade Level | # of Students | Date Administered Pre | Date Administered Post | Name of Test | Form Pre | Form Post | Raw Score Mean Pre | Raw Score Mean Post | Grade Equivalent Mean Pre | Grade Equivalent Mean Post | Raw Score Std. Div. Pre | Raw Score Std. Div. Post | # below 25th%tile Pre | # below 25th%tile Post | 26th to 50th%tile Pre | 26th to 50th%tile Post | 51st to 75th%tile Pre | 51st to 75th%tile Post | 76th%tile and above Pre | 76th%tile and above Post |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Metropolitan Achievement | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 17 | 4-67 | 7-67 | " | B | A | 20 | 19 | | | | | 7 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 56 | " | " | " | " | B | | | 2.6 | 2.6 | | | 33 | 33 | 14 | 14 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| 2 | 56 | 9-66 | 5-67 | " | " | C | 13.6 | 23.8 | | | 2.42 | 2.29 | 11 | 25 | 22 | 19 | 23 | 5 | 0 | 7 |
| 3 | 50 | 4-67 | 7-67 | " | C | " | | | 2.5 | 2.5 | | | 31 | 34 | 15 | 14 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 44 | 9-66 | 5-67 | " | B | " | 11.9 | 16.6 | | | 2.84 | 4.12 | 20 | 21 | 21 | 16 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 1 |
| 3 | 5 | " | " | " | " | B | | | 2.4 | 2.5 | | | 5 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 38 | 4-67 | 7-67 | " | D | " | | | 3.8 | 4.3 | | | 28 | 20 | 9 | 16 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 53 | 9-66 | 5-67 | " | B | C | 16.43 | 23.5 | | | 3.88 | 5.75 | 39 | 18 | 12 | 26 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 2 |
| 5 | 63 | " | " | " | " | " | 14.2 | 18.07 | | | 3.40 | 1.41 | 43 | 34 | 14 | 20 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 2 |
| 5 | 11 | 4-67 | 7-67 | " | " | B | 19 | 20 | | | | | 7 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 37 | " | " | " | D | " | | | 4.1 | 4.5 | | | 24 | 16 | 10 | 15 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 17 | 9-66 | 5-67 | " | A | " | 20.6 | 27.3 | | | | | 8 | 0 | 7 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 6 | 28 | 4-67 | 7-67 | " | D | " | | | 4.7 | 5.0 | | | 16 | 10 | 10 | 14 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 6 | 49 | 9-66 | 5-67 | " | B | C | 18.95 | 23.08 | | | 3.40 | 3.38 | 26 | 23 | 19 | 21 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 |

TABLE IV

GRADUATES FROM TITLE I PROJECT HIGH SCHOOLS
CONTINUING EDUCATION BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL COMPARED WITH STATE NORM

| | 1963-64 | | | 1964-65 | | | 1965-66 | | | 1966-67 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Title I Schools | | All Public Schs. | Title I Schools | | All Public Schs. | Title I Schools | | All Public Schs. | Title I Schools | | All Other Public Schs. |
| | All | 1/3 or More Partici-pants | | All | 1/3 or More Partici-pants | | All | 1/3 or More Partici-pants | | All | 1/3 or More Partici-pants | |
| Total Number of Graduates | | Not Available Information | 9,247 | | Not Available Information | 11,518 | | Not Available Information | 11,165 | 0 | 852 | 10,536 |
| Number of Schools | | | 125 | | | 125 | | | 125 | 0 | 10 | 117 |
| Mean Size of Graduating Class | | | 89 | | | 111 | | | 108 | 0 | 79 | 90 |
| Number of Graduates Continuing Education | | | 5,829 | | | 7,340 | | | 7,135 | 0 | 486 | 7,152 |

## SUMMARY

Public Law 89-10 and the USOE Title I Guidelines continue to serve Idaho educators well in their attempt to meet needs of educationally deprived children. Again, as we did last year, we recommend that as few changes as possible be made in requirements for information from LEA's. Using the same application form for two years was a step in the right direction.

The SEA notes with satisfaction the decrease in the number of reports required by the USOE. The amount of help from USOE personnel during on-site visits has greatly improved over the first year. This is due, in large part, to the establishment of regional USOE offices. Visits from USOE personnel are always welcomed by the SEA and by the few LEA's who are fortunate enough to be included in the busy schedule of USOE personnel when they make in-state visits.

State Title I staff are pleased with the smoothness with which most Title I programs operated last year. It is encouraging that LEA's frequently comment favorably concerning the reasonableness of paperwork required in return for a substantial amount of money to meet educational needs of children in their districts.

Still the number one problem is the funding schedule. This can be resolved only by changes at the Federal level. It is urgent that funds for the school year be allocated no later than March of the preceding school year.

This would allow districts to recruit the best possible personnel for Title I programs rather than to take the "left overs".

At both the Federal and State levels we are urging advance planning in order to improve educational programs and then we are forced to close our eyes to programs that are inferior primarily because poorly qualified "last minute" teachers were all that were available by July 1 when funds could be legally obligated for the coming school year.

At the state level it is virtually impossible to obtain qualified staff after July 1. By then contracts have been signed for the next school year and a person is in danger of jeopardizing himself professionally if he breaks his contract at such a late date or refuses a contract and "takes a chance" until July 1 when State Title I administrative funds become available.